

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the National Era.
TO THE HON. JOHN M. CLAYTON.

I subscribe to you a series of papers, which you have principally moved me to write.

When, in 1844, you were laboring with distinguished zeal and eloquence, to raise Henry Clay to the Chief Magistracy of the nation, I was employed, with humble means, in vindicating the Whig party, and its leading men, from the charge of subservience to Slavery—a party proclaiming itself, at that time, the true and only adequate antagonist of slave-extension, and of the ambitious and rapacious purposes of "the Slave Power." I sought to acquaint myself with the past lives and testimonies of those men, that I might bear witness before the People of their sincerity and worthiness of the public confidence. Among the results of my inquiries was the following:

A young man, born and residing in a slave State, having just completed his preparation for the bar, had the unhappiness to lose his father, who died involved in debt, leaving a considerable number of slaves. The ordinary fate of those unfortunate beings, under such circumstances, need not be described. Happily, a generous friend came to their rescue. The noble-minded youth, on the tacit pledge of the future achievements of a powerful intellect and a great heart—better security than a sealed bond—raised the money to discharge the debts, and gave freedom to the slaves. That young man was John M. Clayton.

Knowing this proud and beautiful antecedent to be yours, and thinking that I had discerned much of a corresponding nature in your subsequent career, in spite of the corrupting and hardening influences of politics, I saw, with unfeigned surprise, your name among the thirty Senators who met in caucus to decide the fate of a deeply interesting measure, now before Congress, but at the time of that meeting scarcely before Congress, and not at all before the country.

I can regret that meeting in no other light than as an attempt to paralyze public sentiment, arrest inquiry, and chain up the free action of the People, by a tyrannous and contemptuous announcement of the fatal "foregone conclusion" that, struggle as they may, their doom is fixed, and they must submit to it. It is a rare refinement in despotism, to extinguish hope before taking any rights.

If this novel mode of legislation be not a direct aggression upon the time-honored usage of the Republic, upon the spirit of the Constitution, and the spirit of Liberty, then I have mistaken them all. If this eager attempt to trammel up consequences does not betoken a tremulous fear of them, then I have badly comprehended human nature.

For one, I protest against this transference of legislation from the Senate House to the cabinet; and I cannot conceal my chagrin at finding John M. Clayton on the list of "Thirty Tyrants."

I propose to present for your consideration, and that of others who may yet be willing to hear reason, some thoughts on the great measure in question, and on the positions and arguments of its advocates. STRIKE, BUT HEAR.

THE NEBRASKA BILL—NO. 1.

HAVE THE UNITED STATES POWER TO PROHIBIT SLAVERY IN THEIR TERRITORIES?

The first question is, whether the People of the United States, by their agents and servants in Congress assembled, have the constitutional power to prescribe to their Territories a rule excluding Slavery. This is first to be, because up to the present moment the greatest deception and the miserable delusions prevail in respect to it. Seeing what I see in the Treasury process, and hearing what I hear of the effects of their impostures upon uninformed and upright men, I am intimately convinced that it is perilous to alight this point, notwithstanding that the authority in question has been established by innumerable precedents, during a period approaching a century; and was never, until very lately, seriously questioned. I do admit, also, considering how often legislators and judges have erred, that honest and intelligent men may feel reluctant to take anything on mere precedent. It is always lawful, and sometimes necessary, to try precedent at the bar of principle.

That it is indispensable to do so in the present case, is proved by the constant, and by no means ineffective, reiteration, throughout all the land, and with all the imposing trappings of type, that FOR CONGRESS TO PROHIBIT SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES, is a violation of the great and fundamental principle of the sovereignty of the People, and of their right of self-government.

An objection so boldly blazoned, and in its application so grave, is not to be despised, be it well or ill founded.

The Territories of the United States have been, and must be, either cessions from States of the Confederacy or from foreign States. A cession of a country is a grant from one Nation to Government to another, of the right of soil, where the subject is already appropriated, and of the right of sovereignty over the territory, unless the act or treaty of cession contain some express qualification of one or both of these rights. Hence it follows, that the People of the United States, in receiving successively from Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, the Indian tribes, France, Spain, and Mexico, cessions of territory, became invested with the full rights of sovereignty and self-government, previous to the cession of the one, and to express reservations of the other. We shall find that in all these cases there was but one instance of the reservation of a right belonging to the sovereignty, and in many of them, of rights touching the soil. Neither class of reservations has any bearing on the present stage of this inquiry. In the cessions of France and Mexico, there was no reservation or qualification whatever of the right of sovereignty. It was all conveyed to the People of the United States.

Were the United States competent to receive these grants of sovereignty? This cannot be disputed, for if they were not thus competent, then full sovereignty, or perhaps any part of sovereignty, was not conveyed nor is now possessed by us, but remains in France and Mexico.

The United States, therefore, did receive, in the case of the French and Mexican cessions, the full sovereignty and supreme dominion over the territories, which were the subjects of those cessions. Do they still hold it?

They hold it still, unless it has been wrested from them by force, or voluntarily conveyed by them to some other Power. A large tract was ceded to Great Britain voluntarily, or from fear of the consequences to Slavery, viz: all that tract lying between 49 deg and 54 deg, 40 min of north latitude, containing about 300,000 square miles, beside Vancouver's and other islands on the coast thereof, and on our present coast amounting probably to 10,000 square miles, or 350,000 in all. All this a Slave President on a solemn occasion declared from the throne was "by right unquestionable" ours. All this was the same President, with the approval of the Senate, ceded to Great Britain. No Southern man ever denied, or will now deny, the validity of that treaty. In all probability, that treaty saved the South from a visit of a British mean squadron, and a British army, including certain regiments from the West Indies, headed by a proclamation of the established policy of Britain in relation to blacks. Vancouver's Island, and all the rest, the island appearing, in fact, to that part of Oregon which remains to us, are gone

from our grasp, never to return, unless the slave States should give us leave to annex Canada, which they will probably do some day in the Greek Islands. Of course, the United States must have had full sovereignty over this territory, or they could not have ceded it, and Great Britain would never have treated with us for it.

Perhaps it will be answered, it is very true the United States have full sovereignty over their Territories as against foreign sovereigns, both when they receive and when they cede territory, and, in fact, at all other times; but then they have not that sovereignty against the sovereign People, who are settlers, owners, and occupants of soil within the Territories. Some distinction of this kind is constantly insisted, of course, in the vaguest manner. It is time that this *hocus focus* were sifted, or scouted from the field of controversy—drummed out with those who are its authors. The use of it is as disreputable to freemen as it is inhuman to the slave. It can be intended for no purpose but to mystify; which, in this case, is as good as to convince, because in honest minds it equally paralyzes resistance. The adversary desires no more. Inaction, acquiescence, are as valuable to him as concurrence and support. Let the free States be passive, and leave the slave States alone; and, like the weird sisters, "They'll do, they'll do, and they'll do."

The settlers and inhabitants of any Territory, if citizens of the United States, are, in common with all other citizens of the United States, partakers of the common right of sovereignty over the Territories, which reside to the fullest extent in the whole body of the People; but they do not, by becoming settlers of the Territories, acquire any additional or peculiar right of sovereignty over them. If they do, when and how does the right attach to them, and at what moment detach itself from the whole People of the United States? It is plain, that whatever sovereign rights the former acquire, must be in derogation of the previous and complete sovereignty of the latter. Is it when one settler enters, or a dozen, or twenty, or fifty, or a community large enough to form a Government? If it attaches to five hundred, or five thousand, it attaches to fifty, or twenty, or to one, the moment he enters. He may make laws, subject only to that general jurisdiction which belongs to the United States, but which would apply in this case only in a limited sense, as it applies to the States. Sovereignty would descend upon the single settler, just as certainly as upon the heir apparent in a hereditary monarchy, or the ruler or domineer of the reigning sovereign, and rather more mysteriously. The first quarter would be a king. This is too absurd; but it is precisely the kind of right which the States, in a later delusion, which is urged with effect, as sound reason, by hundreds of pre-echoed-throughout the country.

The right to Territorial self-government attaches to the settlers only when the United States grant it, by defining the boundaries, enacting laws, and appointing officers, or authorizing the inhabitants to elect them; but even then they have this right only so far as the United States think proper, out of its full reservoir of sovereign rights, to impart to them. In organizing the earliest Territories, they provided for the appointment by the President of the United States, of a Governor and Judges, investing them jointly with legislative power, and not giving to the inhabitants the election of one of those important officers, nor of any officer, even of a town, parish, or school district, unless the authorities, thus constituted, thought proper in their legislative capacity to confer upon them the right to elect them. At a later period, Congress instituted *Legislative Councils* in the Territories; but the appointment of the members was vested in the President of the United States. Lastly, Legislatures, eligible by the citizens, have been wisely substituted in the Territorial acts. But how far are any of these systems from conceding to the people of a Territory the full right of sovereignty, even in the somewhat limited sense in which it all belongs to a State? In all these cases, and at all times up to this day, Congress has reserved to itself the right of revising the acts of the Territorial Legislatures, and vetoing or modifying them as it deems expedient; and it has exercised this right in various instances.

We see, therefore, the people of the United States bearing, from the first moment of the acquisition of territory up to the end of its territorial existence, the most undoubted badges of full and complete sovereignty over it. No legal Government, except the one, at the time of its acts, and no legal Government, when created, can do anything contrary to their will. They can at any time annul its laws, and abrogate its existence. And where it shall have attained a population which may entitle it, if erected into a State, to two Senators and a full Representative in the House, it can escape from pupillage only by the consent of the people of the United States, expressed through their agents in Congress.

If all things do not demonstrate the existence of complete sovereignty, supreme dominion in the people of the United States over their Territories, subject to no restrictions or limitations except those imposed by conscience and by God, then there is no such thing as sovereignty, actual or ideal, in the world or in works of political science.

The States within their respective jurisdictions possess this same sovereignty, with the exception of a few of its highest and most comprehensive attributes, which the People have thought proper to exercise, not through their State officers, but through the instrumentality of the Government of the United States—such as raising a revenue by taxing imports, coining money, raising and supporting armies and navies, regulating commerce, and making war and treaties of peace, friendship, and commerce. Thus full or integral sovereignty is divided and distributed by the People between the several States and the United States, the latter possessing its most important, and the former its most numerous, attributes—each having a part, and both together the whole. What they both together possess over the States, the United States alone possess over their Territories.

But it is admitted that every State has power to prohibit Slavery, or to abolish it, if it already exists. Then, may not the United States within their Territories prohibit or abolish it?

STRIKE, BUT HEAR.

ANCIENT TITLES—THE FIRST PROJECT OF AN ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC ROAD.

A correspondent, who takes an interest in such matters, informs us that—

"Among the curiosities in the way of royal liberality is an old charter, dated 1628, and confirmed by act of Parliament in 1633, and now of record in Edinburgh, in Scotland. This document, which was intended to convey the whole basin of the St. Lawrence to the Earl of Stirling, was made to include the whole of California and the Peninsula, with the islands and fisheries in the Gulf! It was so granted to keep up the right, which the Earl claimed, in virtue of the discovery of California, by Sir Francis Drake, who took possession of the whole coast in the name of 'her highness' Queen Elizabeth. The natives in fear of the Spaniards, readily accepted the protection of the new adventurers, and formally made over the country to the English Sovereign. Quickly the Jesuits pushed their establishments into the gold regions, while England's enterprise was killed by their evil reports of the country. They were to receive a gratuity, which they even accepted, the name of 'Sir Francis Drake's Bay,' or 'Bay of San Francisco,' modifying it only to suit their religious notions, yet not enough to arouse English

suspicion. But California, the right to which England desired to maintain, and to which, for many years, she strove to find a passage by the lakes, was farther from the basin of the St. Lawrence than had been supposed. 'Whatever may be the distance,' says the charter, we grant you a strip of land one hundred and fifty miles wide, on each side of the passage, or portage, between the head-waters of the St. Lawrence and the Gulf of California! Thus, to tempt the grantee to open a communication with California and the Pacific, King Charles grants him a right of way across the Continent of America, with a country three hundred miles wide, to build his road with! It seems to us that the King and the Earl are not to be beaten in grandeur of ideas by any of our modern projectors.

"But the most singular part of this story is yet to be told. There exists an heir to this immense property, who, though not claiming anything out of the grants above named, nevertheless, in law he holds the title deeds of the whole country, but is content to claim a limited portion, within the jurisdiction of Great Britain. Great efforts have, for obvious reasons, been made to break up the claim, but they have held for twenty-three years against all the assaults of the Crown."

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1854.

MR. BURRITT'S LECTURE THIS EVENING.

We would remind our readers that a free Lecture, on a subject of deep and universal interest, will be delivered at Carus's Saloon, at half past seven o'clock this evening.

THE WHIG PARTY—IS IT, OR IS IT NOT? DUTY OF FREE-SOILERS.

The action of Mr. Badger and his associates in the Senate, and the conduct of the Richmond (Va.) *Whig* and other Whig journals of the South, seemed for a time to have alienated Southern Whigs as a body, from Northern Whigs, to such an extent that re-union appeared impossible. But, it may be doubted whether an impassable gulf has been placed between the two sections. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that even those Southern Whig leaders who are most desperate in their advocacy of the Bill to repeal the Missouri Compromise, and contemptuous in their language to the North, refuse to affiliate with Southern Democrats, and continue their opposition to the Administration, thus evidently holding themselves ready to consider any overtures that may hereafter be made to them by their late Northern associates. Nor must we forget, that the course of John Bell in the Senate, in opposing the Nebraska Bill, has not been disapproved by the Legislature of his State, or provoked severe criticism in the columns of the Whig Press of Tennessee; that several leading Whig papers of the Slave States, such as the *Raleigh Register*, the *Louisville Journal*, and the *New Orleans Whig Press*, have deprecated the attempt to repeal the Missouri Compromise; that the *National Intelligencer*, the central organ of Conservative Whiggery, whether of the North or South, has labored earnestly and consistently to defeat it; that several of the Southern Whigs of the House of Representatives have already avowed their disapproval of the Bill, and while eight of them voted against referring it to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, six voted for the motion.

These facts are not without their influence on prominent Whigs at the North. They encourage the hope that the Whig Party, organized as it has hitherto been, on what is called a National platform, may be revived, and again come into power. Hence, the strenuous efforts made in Congress to augment the Southern Whig opposition to the Bill. Hence, the disposition everywhere apparent, to cling to the Whig name, to Whig organization, to Whig candidates—and to claim victories over the Administration Party, won by Whigs, Free-Soilers, and disaffected Democrats, as Whig victories. We think we can discover a determination to reorganize the Whig Party of the North, and make the Nebraska Question subserve its purposes, and then, when the time shall come for another Presidential election, join forces with Whigs of the South, for the elevation to the Presidency of some "National man," so called, not obnoxious to Slavery;—

Sisyphus, as of old, rolling the stone up the hill, to see it roll down again!

In the returns, for example, from New Hampshire, we heard much of the *Whig* vote, little of that of the Independent Democrats; and now we have Whig victories announced in Connecticut and Rhode Island, when, in fact, they are Anti-Nebraska victories. Hear Mr. Chandler, a Conservative Whig member of the House, of high repute, from Philadelphia:

"He appealed to the Whigs to give no heed to the meers that the Free party was rent in twain. A party founded on principle would exist as long as there were measures to bring that principle into action. The Whig party had more to fear from the crumbling ruins of the Democratic party, than from any elements of discord within its own ranks."

"The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Clingman] referred yesterday, very commiseratingly, to the decay of the Whig party in the East—a party in which, he said, gentlemen were reared, and by which he had attained his well-earned honors. The gentleman was ignorant at the time, probably, of the election news which came flashing over the wires from Connecticut."

"Mr. Clingman. I had heard it."

"Mr. Chandler. Then it was an unfortunate speech. [Laughter.] It was not the life so much as the mission of a party which ought to be considered; nor would any difference of opinion on this question prevent union on one."

The party which had been led by Clay and taught by Webster had loftier aims than expediency and nobler ends than mere self-preservation. They were ready to declare, and act on the declaration, that the duties of life were greater than life. As for himself, and those who labored with him in the Whig cause, seeking their hands of all necessity of association with those of another party, they should vote for whatever they deemed right, without regard to the effect it might have upon them as party men. If they had to fall, there would be inscribed upon their graves the Spartan epitaph: 'We lie here in obedience to the commands of our country.'"

Now, respectable as, may be the Whig and Democratic organizations, and important as may have been some of their acts, we cannot forget that they were never instituted for the purpose of dealing with Questions of Slavery; that while their Southern sections have uniformly made such Questions paramount, their Northern sections have considered them of

minor consequence, so that the policy of both of them, acting as National Parties, has always been controlled on those Questions, by the will of the Slave Power; that both of them have uniformly overlooked the inherent aggressiveness of Slavery, supposing that it could be satisfied by concessions, which in fact only provoked further demands; to be satisfied with still other concessions; that by the combined efforts of their leaders in 1850, the judgment of the North and West in favor of the Wilmot Proviso was overruled, the original policy of Slavery-restriction by the Federal Government suspended, and the abominable Fugitive Slave Act passed, receiving the votes of Democratic Representatives, so called, and the sanction of a Whig President; and that both, in 1852, adopted as their platform the legislation of 1850, and pledged themselves to its support, as a finality on the Question of Slavery.

In view of all these facts, knowing as we do, the nature and workings of these organizations, the force of the Principles they represent, the Prejudices they embody, the Policy which they have always pursued, we can trust neither of them on any great Question arising between the Slave Interest and the Free Interest of the country.

There is a Party of Freedom among us, by some, called the Free Soil, by others, the Free Democracy, by others, the Independent Democratic Party. It has voters in every Free State, and in several of the Slave States, and in the most important of the Free States it holds the balance of power, has numerical force enough to decide the struggle in any case between the two old political organizations. Its creed has been announced to the country, and is thoroughly Democratic.—No Slavery within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government; no interference with Slavery in the States, except through the force of example and discussion; the election of officers of the Federal and State Governments, by the People, directly, when possible; Free Lands for Free Men; Cheap Postage, internal and inter-oceanic; Universal Education; Opposition to Monopolies; Jealousy of Centralization; Maintenance of State Rights; Strict Construction of the Constitution; a Policy steadily directed towards the ultimate removal of all restrictions on Commerce; Sympathy with the Cause of Republicanism in Europe; Liberal Laws in regard to Foreign Immigrants.

This Party is the precise opposite of the Slave Power, and it was hoped by many that the flagrant attempt of this Power to annul the Missouri Compromise would produce such a disruption of old party ties, and arouse such a spirit of determined resistance to its demands, that the masses, at least of the People of the North, would be willing to rally under the banner of this Party of Freedom. Are these hopes to be fulfilled? Where are the indications? Look at the columns of the New York *Evening Post*, and those Democratic papers that oppose this Nebraska Bill. They are all Anti-Slavery, but not the least indication do they afford of a willingness to forego their connection with a Party which claims Franklin Pierce as its Presidential head. Look at the New York *Tribune*, with its hundred and forty thousand subscribers, and at other Whig papers sympathizing with it. They are Anti-Slavery, but what evidence do they show of a willingness to give up their connection with the Whig Party, and to sustain a grand rally in behalf of the Party of Freedom?

Let not the Free-Soilers or Independent Democrats be deceived. In New York, some years ago, during an Anti-Slavery excitement among the Democrats of that State, similar to that which now prevails among the Whigs, they formally merged their identity in the Democratic organization—and in less than two years after that, had the pleasure of seeing that Party sweeping by the Baltimore platform, and voting for General Pierce! Had they maintained their independent existence, they might have saved a large portion of the Radical Democracy of New York from apostasy. Shall that lesson be lost upon them? Northern Whigs now appear reckless of Southern support. They have everything to gain, nothing to lose, by strenuous opposition to the Nebraska Bill. They are honest in their opposition, but clear-sighted enough to see that it furnishes ground for reorganizing the Whig party. That work is going on, and the Free-Soilers, or Independent Democrats, are invited to help them. How can they refuse? Is not the great issue the Nebraska Question, and are not the Whigs sound upon this? How can Free-Soilers, devoted to Human Freedom, clamorous for a union of the friends of Freedom, hesitate at uniting themselves with the Whigs? Remember the lesson taught you by the Radical Democracy of New York, and by an Anti-Slavery Whig Administration in 1850!

What then? Shall there be no united effort? Shall the Administration and the Slave Power prevail, through our divisions? Not at all. Let honest Whigs and Democrats unite with you, in a party of Freedom. They know that you never have betrayed the cause of Human Rights, and that you will not; but you know that the organizations with which they have acted, have betrayed that cause, do not understand its claims, and will, under the pressure of the Slave Power, betray it again.

But if this be asking too much, there is still a mode in which you can make your united efforts tell against Slavery in its present movements. Maintain your distinct, independent organization, but agree to co-operate with other organizations, in the choice of candidates perfectly sound on the Nebraska Question, and confided in by all. Co-operation, not Fusion, should be the motto. Co-operation will secure the defeat, in most cases, of Pro-Slavery or Nebraska candidates;—therefore co-operate. Fusion will do no more, while it will inevitably result in placing Anti-Slavery men and Anti-Slavery interests at the mercy of a Party, which, acting nationally, has never shown itself any more entitled to the approbation of freemen, on the Question of Slavery, than the Democratic Party, so called.

Our Free Soil friends must take care lest they find themselves carried as grist to the mill; an operation, for which the New York *Tribune*, in all its real Anti-Slavery spirit, and its independence of party, is admirably adapted, the more so, because it is admitted of constitutional impostor, rather than from cold premeditation.

RUSSIA, ENGLAND, AND THE UNITED STATES.

"She is actuated by no regard for Turkey, but she is looking to the extension of the field for her own manufacturing enterprise and capital. In that wide field for commercial enterprise, which is the real prize at which Great Britain is looking, we have a powerful motive to prefer the success of the East. The one is our rival as a manufacturing and commercial nation, the other comes into competition with us. Whilst, therefore, our sympathies are with Turkey, because she is weak, and is threatened by a Government that is strong, these sympathies are not so strong that they may not be overcome when our interests are fully ascertained to be involved by the disclosures as to the policy and object of Great Britain."—*Washington Union*.

While exposing yesterday the insidious attempt of "the organ" to arouse prejudice against England, and enlist sympathy for Russia, in the approaching struggle between the Eastern and Western Powers of Europe, we promised to notice the commercial reasons assigned, for preferring the success of Russia to that of England, France, and Turkey. These reasons, such as they are, are stated in the extract quoted above, there is so little in them that it is difficult to make them the subject of an argument.

If the East succeeded, he will take permanent possession of the Principality, acquire a protectorate over Turkey, be supreme in Central Europe, and probably be able to embarrass the commerce of Great Britain with the East Indies. What are we to gain from all this? The commercial policy of Russia is not so liberal as that of England. It produces little that we want, wants little that we produce. Were she in possession of Constantinople, it would be as unimportant to us, as it is now.

If the allied Powers succeed, the independence of Turkey is preserved. England may obtain additional facilities of commerce, a larger market for her products, but her settled policy now is Free Trade; and wherever her influence extends it is felt in favor of Free Trade—than which nothing can be more advantageous to us, in a commercial point of view.

Competition in trade, manufactures, and the arts, between nations, with great resources for all these forms of enterprise, and resembling one another in energy, tact, and intelligence, is their appropriate stimulant, quickening their enterprise, and developing their resources. Under its energizing influences, the mightiest results are produced.

Great Britain and the United States are competitors, but at the same time they are complements to each other. We supply her with what she must have, but can get nowhere else; she supplies us with what we need, and can obtain nowhere else on so favorable terms. Hence, while rivals in commerce, and to a certain extent in manufactures, we are dependent upon one another, more than any other two nations. From this it follows, that the expansion of the resources and power of the one is a positive benefit to the other.

To talk of Russia being a natural ally of the United States, and England our natural enemy, is sheer madness. Look at this table, which any one may verify by examining the yearly tables of our exports and imports:

	Russia.	Great Britain and her Dependencies.
Imports	\$1,581,660	\$106,595,220
Exports of Domestic products	1,066,748	124,338,381
Exports of Foreign products	138,732	8,902,363
Total	\$2,782,120	\$233,730,964

The sum total of our commerce yearly with Great Britain and her dependencies, nearly \$234,000,000; with Russia, not quite \$3,000,000! And in our petty trade with Russia, she takes less of us than we take from her, while in our magnificent commerce with Great Britain, she receives from us \$32,000,000 more than we buy of her. In fact, our trade with Great Britain and her dependencies is greater than with the whole world beside, and she buys from us nearly four-sixths of all our exports of domestic products!

Suppose, then, in the vicissitudes of a war in the East, England should come into possession of Egypt, what commercial interest of ours would suffer? The sum total of our domestic products now consumed by all Turkey is but two hundred and twenty-five thousand. Less she cannot consume, under whatever domination she may fall; but under the protectorate of a Power like England, with her Free Trade policy, she would be apt to increase her consumption.

But the key to the preference of "the organ," we presume, is to be found in its predilection for Cuba. It hates England because she is the ally of Spain, and it supposes her influence to be the chief obstacle to the acquisition of Cuba. It would prefer the success of the East and the prostration of English power, so that the project of annexation might be ventured upon with impunity. In other words, it would rejoice to see that nation, which buys from us nearly two-thirds of all our domestic products, whose commerce is of more value to us than that we carry on with all the world, which is the best customer for the cotton of the South and the breadstuffs and animal products of the West, utterly prostrated by Russian Power, in a war, too, waged by that Power for its own aggrandizement, by the dismemberment of an offending State; and all this, so that this Government might obtain a few thousand square miles more of Slave Territory!

This is Pro-Slavery statesmanship!

A LUCID EXPLANATION.—The Louisville Democrat says: "We confess there is a part of the policy or conduct of the friends of the bill that we don't understand the philosophy of; we refer to the attacks upon Mr. Cutting, who led the vote of reference. What is to be gained by accusing him and his friends of dishonesty—of a design to defeat the bill, whilst pretending to be in its favor?"

And the Louisville Journal responds: "Why, the truth is, dear neighbor, the Nebraska bill is already as dead as a doornail, and the ebullition of more or less fury can break nobody but the parties concerned. Mr. Breckinridge (at whom, among others, our neighbor's strictures are directed) exclaimed, in his late speech, with graceful and pathetic emphasis: 'Does not the gentleman from New York know that when that bill went to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, it went to its grave?'"

While the insinuations of Mr. B. might well restrain him from speaking against good of the dead, he manifestly felt restrained by no such delicacy toward the wicked living; hence his glowing eulogy upon Nebraska, and his fierce invective against Cutting."

PUBLIC CHARITIES, AND WHO RECEIVE THEM.

During the year ending March 1, 1854, in-door and out-door relief granted by the directors of the Cincinnati City Infirmary was extended to natives of—

Ireland	1,468
Germany	803
United States	661
All other foreigners	141
Colored	2
Not reported	25
Total	3,102

Nearly a half Irish, a little more than a fourth German, a fifth natives of the United States, who of course comprise the great body of the people. It is well. But when such indisputable facts are placed before us in this country, where industry and want cannot go together, it is too much to conjecture that improvidence and idleness are the sources of poverty and desolation in Ireland? And if this be true, what has made that people improvident and idle? Oppression, practiced toward them the world over, has not made the Jews improvident and idle. Oppression did not make the early Quakers so. Oppression did not make the Huguenots so. Oppression did not make the Puritans so. Oppression did not, indeed, make the Israelites of old so. What has made the people of certain portions of Ireland improvident and idle? That it is not constitutional with them, we know, by the exceeding aptness and great success of portions of them. Perhaps it is the same thing that has produced the same effects in Italy, in Spain, in Mexico, and wherever the Papal Power has a controlling influence over the political and social institutions of the people. The religion of the Roman Catholic Church we do not reproach; but the temporal power and influence of its hierarchy every lover of Freedom and of human happiness and prosperity must denounce.

"X," of the *Sun*, styles Mr. Clingman's speech on the Nebraska question as a "model speech." He adds: "Mr. Wright of Pennsylvania, followed on the same side. He could not sustain himself at home on the Clayton amendment, but was ready to vote for the bill, with or without it. *Alas facta sunt*. Mr. Wright made a good speech, full of constitutional devotion to the Union, and of loyalty to the President and the Democratic party. Pennsylvania is always ready to sacrifice herself on the altar of our common country."

"Full of loyalty to the President!" Mr. Wright's constituents will probably feel complimented by this remark.

THE GADSDEN TREATY.—"Ion," who has watched and prayed for the success of this measure, this morning expresses the opinion that "an unaccountable indifference" is manifested in the Senate in regard to it.

NEGRO HUNG.—We find in the Baltimore *American* an item to the effect that, about ten or fifteen days ago, the overseer of Judge Worthington, at Point Washington, in Mississippi, was killed by one of his negroes. The murderer fled, but was pursued, caught, and lodged in jail at Greenville. On Sunday, the 19th ult., some forty overseers from the neighboring plantations forcibly took him from the jail, and carried him to Princeton, near the scene of the murder, and hung him. The occurrence had created great excitement in the neighborhood.

CUBA ANNEXATION.—A letter from New York to the Baltimore *American* says:

"The letter recently written by Archbishop Hughes, on Cuba, is the cause of considerable remark. Many Roman Catholics are in favor of Cuban annexation, and hence their dissatisfaction at the Bishop's course."

The Bishop has probably not promised himself the achievement of pleasing everybody.

EXTRACTS FROM OUR CORRESPONDENCE.

Ashburnham, Mass., March 27, 1854.—In the address of the Hon. Henry Wilson, in this place, on Thursday evening last, the fair was expressed, that unless the people continued their manifestations against the Nebraska inquiry by popular demonstrations, the bill would yet be carried in the House of Representatives. Such an event is not only possible, but quite probable. Even Mr. Cutting, who succeeded in the reference to the Committee of the Whole, in his remarks, spoke decidedly in favor of the measure, and, if unchanged in his present views, will vote for the bill on its final passage. How many more of the New York members, and others from the free States, who voted with Mr. Cutting, may not be found to do the same thing? Who knows what double-twisted amendments will be yet tacked on, to befoul Northern men?

Now, why will these men suffer themselves to be beguiled by such maneuvering? Look at the Senate—see how they were led off from the main question, by balancing these skillful amendments, got up to beguile and deceive us. Look at the Northern men, who are to learn to trade to advantage with these speculators in Slavery! If principles of Justice, of Liberty, and Humanity, could be converted into wooden clocks, nutmegs, and tin ware, do you think we should so often be found so overreached?

Yes, we must continue to keep up the fire, or else our agents at Washington, when the time comes, will forget to ask themselves why this effort to repeal the Missouri Compromise, if all these amendments are to operate in favor of Freedom; they will exhaust themselves in taxing their ingenuity how to satisfy their constituents that these "amendments" are not only more Democratic, but the very perfection of that system which the North desires—namely, Freedom in these Territories! Having done this, their re-election is secured, the South have got all they asked, and the North, of course, is perfectly satisfied.

Here, I fancy, is the real "fix" in which our Northern Compromisers, from this time forth to the final action in the House, will roll and tumble.

Now, sir, let this matter be put right. Let these men know, that if they are determined to go "a wooing" after Southern favor, they shall come back "fleece," at least of Northern garments to hide their nakedness.

Bradford, Merrimack co. N. H., March 29, 1854.—The result of our election two weeks ago is felt by the shrewd Democracy as a stunning blow, from the effects of which it is impossible for them to recover. With a majority last year of 5,400 on the Governor's vote, and 89 in the House of Representatives, they felt confident before the election that they could sustain themselves against the rising indignation of the people on the subject of the Nebraska outrage. Many of them now admit that if the Nebraska Bill had been introduced into Congress a month earlier, or the election

had taken place a month later than it did, their defeat would have been overwhelming and irretrievable. As it is, they have lost the House beyond a peradventure, and if they still persist in claiming it, it is only for the sake of influencing the elections in Connecticut and Rhode Island.